

1
2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

8 **CHRISTENE B. TOGNARELLI**
9 **Plaintiff**

10 vs.

Case No. 3:11-cv-00891

11 **MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC**
12 **RESISTRATIONSYSTEMS, INC;**
13 **GUILD MORTGAGE COMPANY;**
14 **AND CAL-WESTERN**
15 **RECONVEYANCE CORPORATION**
16 **Defendants**

ORDER REGARDING:

17 **PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO**
18 **DEFENDANT CAL-WESTERN RECONVEYANCE CORPORATION'S**
19 **MOTION TO DISMISS**

20 Comes now Plaintiff CHRISTENE B. TOGNARELLI and through legal counsel,
21 WAYNE M. PRESSEL, requests the Court to extend the time for filing her opposition to
22 the Motion to Dismiss brought by Defendant CAL-WESTERN RECONVEYANCE
23 CORPORATION pursuant to LR6-1 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States
24 District Court for the District of Nevada. The Defendant's Motion to Dismiss was filed
25 on December 20, 2011, and a response from Plaintiff was due on December 30, 2011.
26 This Motion for Extension of Time to Respond is filed on January 4, 2012, and requests
27 an extension until the end of January 5, 2012.
28


1 Plaintiff shows the Court that:

- 2 1) There have been no previous extensions of time granted to Plaintiff concerning a
3 response to this Motion to Dismiss or to any matter or motion in this case;
4
5 2) The basis for this request for extension is excusable neglect in Plaintiff's counsel's
6 error in calendaring and calculating the time for response; and
7
8 3) The period of extension is six (6) days causing no delays in the litigation.

9 WHEREFORE: Plaintiff CHRISTENE TOGNARELLI requests the Court to grant her an
10 extension of time in which to file her response the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss to the
11 end of Thursday, January 5, 2012.

12 This 4th Day of January 2012.

13 Respectfully submitted by:

14
15
16
17
18 
Wayne M. Pressel, Attorney for
Plaintiff Tognarelli

19 ORDER
20

21 Plaintiff's request for an extension of time by which to file her opposition to Cal-Western
22 Reconveyance Corporation's Motion to Dismiss (#3) is DENIED as moot. Per Local Rule 7-2
23 (b), Plaintiff's opposition is not due until January 6, 2012, and she has already filed the
24 opposition on January 5, 2012. IT IS SO ORDERED this 5th day of January, 2012.

25
26
27 

28 LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE